
2003-2004 *No Child Left Behind—Blue Ribbon Schools Program*
Cover Sheet

Name of Principal Mrs. Nancy Manley
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name T. H. Rogers Elementary School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address 5840 San Felipe Rd.
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Houston, Texas 77057-3059
City State Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

Tel. (713) 917-3565 Fax (713) 917-3622

Website/URL http://ms.houstonisd.org/THRogers/ E-mail nmanley@houstonisd.org

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

(Principal's Signature) Date _____

Name of Superintendent* Dr. Kaye Stripling

District Name Houston Independent School District Tel. (713) 892-6300

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

(Superintendent's Signature) Date _____

Name of School Board
President/Chairperson Mrs. Karla Cisneros

I have reviewed the information in this package, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature) Date _____

*Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.

PART I – ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools with one principal, Even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has not been in school improvement status or been identified by the state as “persistently dangerous” within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state’s adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2003-2004 school year.
3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.
4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 1998.
5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
6. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if the OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
7. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school, or the school district as a whole, has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution’s equal protection clause.
8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U. S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II – DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district:
- | | |
|------------|--------------------------|
| <u>186</u> | Elementary schools |
| <u>37</u> | Middle schools |
| <u>0</u> | Junior high schools |
| <u>23</u> | High schools |
| <u>52</u> | Other (Briefly explain*) |
| <u>298</u> | TOTAL |

*Schools that offer programs that are not typical of most school programs. Examples of these types of schools are early childhood centers, specialty schools for health professions and law enforcement, behavioral programs, drop back in schools, schools for pregnant teens, etc.

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure \$ 5,323.00
- Average State Per Pupil Expenditure \$ 5,030.00

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

- [X] Urban or large central city
- [] Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
- [] Suburban
- [] Small city or town in a rural area
- [] Rural

4. 3 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

 If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?

5. Number of students enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total		Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
K	11	11	22		7			
1	27	19	46		8			
2	17	15	32		9			
3	19	15	34		10			
4	38	29	67		11			
5	34	32	66		12			
6					Other			
TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL								267

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the students in the school:
- | | |
|---------------|--------------------------------|
| <u>24.8</u> % | White |
| <u>15.8</u> % | Black or African American |
| <u>30.5</u> % | Hispanic or Latino |
| <u>28.9</u> % | Asian/Pacific Islander |
| <u>0</u> % | American Indian/Alaskan Native |
| 100% | Total |

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 5.6 %

(The rate includes the total number of students who transferred to or from different schools between October 1 and the end of the school year, divided by the total number of students in the school as of October 1, multiplied by 100.)

(1)	Number of students who transferred to the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	10
(2)	Number of students who transferred from the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	7
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	17
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	304
(5)	Subtotal in row (3)divided by total in row(4)	5.6%
(6)	Amount in row (5)multipplied by 100	560

8. Limited English Proficient students in the school: 0.3 %
1 Total Number Limited English Proficient

Number of languages represented: 1
Specify languages: Spanish

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 42.3 %
113 Total Number Students Who Qualify

If this method does not produce a reasonably accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families or the school does not participate in the federally supported lunch program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services: 47.6 %
150 Total Number of Students served

(The high percentage of students in our special education program is due to the severity of the students' disabilities. The students in the multiply impaired program must have specialized nursing care, instruction, and OT/PT services. Due to the severe shortage of certified teachers of the deaf, the school district made a decision to educate all deaf students at T. H. Rogers.)

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

<u>1</u> Autism	<u>15</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>78</u> Deafness	<u>4</u> Other Health Impaired
<u> </u> Deaf-Blindness	<u> </u> Specific Learning Disability
<u> </u> Hearing Impairment	<u>24</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>31</u> Mental Retardation	<u> </u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>150</u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>17</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff	
	<u>Full-time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrators	<u>3</u>	<u> </u>
Classroom teachers	<u>34</u>	<u> </u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>21</u>	<u> </u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>22</u>	<u> </u>
Support staff	<u>4</u>	<u> </u>
Total number	<u>84</u>	<u> </u>

Average school student-"classroom teacher" ratio: 8.2

12. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. The student dropout rate is Defined by the state. The student drop-off rate is the difference between the number of entering students and the number of exiting students from the same cohort. (From the same cohort, subtract the number of exiting students from the number of entering students; divide that number by the number of entering students; multiply by 100 to get the percentage drop-off rate.) Briefly explain in 100 words or fewer any major discrepancy between the dropout rate and the drop-off rate. (Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates and only high schools need to supply drop-off rates.)

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Daily student attendance	94%	95%	94%	95%	94%
Daily teacher attendance	95%	94%	94%	98%	96%
Teacher turnover rate	9.5%	6%	7%	14%	10%
Student dropout rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Student drop-off rate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

PART III – SUMMARY

T. H. Rogers Elementary School, one of the Houston Independent School District's many Magnet programs, is devoted entirely to providing the best education not only for special education but also gifted and talented children from across the entire area. The staff addresses the vast learning requirements of a wide range and age of students divided into three large populations. Rogers Elementary serves kindergarten through fifth grade gifted and talented children in its Vanguard program, pre-school through fifth grade deaf students in the Regional Day School Program for the Deaf (R.D.S.P.D.), and birth through fifth grade Multiply Impaired (MI) students. A special staff numbering 84 paraprofessionals, speech therapists, social workers, nurses, audiologists, occupational and physical therapists, teachers, counselors and administrators work as a team to serve the special needs of our students. The ethnic make up of the elementary school is 15.8% African American, 28.9% Asian, 30.5% Hispanic, 0% Native American and 24.8% White/Other. The student population is 47.6% special education and 42.3% free/reduced lunch. We have a 94% attendance rate.

The Vanguard program uses a curriculum that focuses on higher level thinking skills, the MI students work on a functionally based curriculum, and the Deaf students use a total communication language program. Each of these groups has many opportunities to work with the others both in classroom settings and in socially oriented, extra-curricular, age appropriate activities. One emphasis in Vanguard is a volunteer program in which gifted students begin assisting the MI students in the primary grades, and continue throughout middle school. Deaf and Vanguard students share ancillary classes, physical education classes, assemblies, lunch, field trips, clubs and organizations, and extra-curricular activities. The Vanguard students participate in Sign-Language and Spanish classes as a foreign language.

The mission of T. H. Rogers School is to provide all students with the educational opportunity to develop to their fullest potential. The school ensures that a supportive learning environment integrates the special populations, provides enhanced learning opportunities, and reflects a continuing commitment to excellence.

Two years ago, through the assistance of the Bush Foundation Grant, Rogers installed an in-house TV studio dedicated to instructional emphasis on Media Literacy. Elementary students are given the opportunity to participate in the studio announcements, newscasts, and special presentations. During the summer of 2003, a teleprompter and advanced computer programs were purchased to enhance the production of the daily broadcasts, which are delivered via cable network to our elementary students each day.

Each student population excels in its specific arena. The Vanguard students remain at the top in academic testing scores within the Houston Independent School District and elementary students continue to excel in area academic competitions among students in the city and state. Some of our higher functioning Multiply Impaired Special Education students are successfully working in jobs in the local community. The Deaf students are learning communication skills that will allow them to integrate into society, which helps them to become independent, productive citizens that contribute to the economy. Rogers Elementary has also been very successful in involving Houston's corporate and civic institutions to provide individual students with equipment and special projects for the school. Two non-profit organizations, Be An Angel Fund and Just Like Us, work very closely with the school staff to provide special equipment and supplies to our economically deprived students. The staff, district, and community continually strive to provide a quality, integrated program, which meets the needs of all elementary students.

Part IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

1. State Tests and Exclusionary Criteria

The Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) was first administered in the Houston Independent School District (HISD) and in Texas in March 2003. It replaced the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) as a major part of the State Accountability Rating System. The school ratings, as designated by the TEA, range from “Low Performing” to “Exemplary.” T. H. Rogers has proudly been rated TAAS Exemplary every year but one since 1994. This past year was a pilot-test TAKS year and we were rated Exemplary once again. Passing the third grade reading and fourth grade writing tests is required for promotion to the next grade.

Every 3rd through 5th grade student is administered the TAKS; however, there is a procedure in place to exclude students from TAKS if they are labeled for Special Education and the Admissions Review and Dismissal Committee (ARD) makes that decision. All Vanguard students are administered the TAKS in English, including all Special Education students and English Language Learners (ELL).

The TAAS and TAKS test results are reported in the following language: “Commended” represents the highest score of mastery (Meeting All Objectives); “Meets Minimum Expectations” (Met Standard) is an indicator of a passing score; and “Does Not Meet Minimum Expectations” (Below Standard) is an indicator of a failing score. The passing score is an indicator that the student has achieved mastery of at least 70% of the objectives on any subtest, such as reading, writing, or mathematics.

Stanford 9 is a national, norm-referenced test, which HISD has used since the 1999 school year. The only students excluded from taking the Stanford 9 are those students in our MI and deaf programs. Our MI and Deaf special education students take the SDAA (State-Developed Alternative Assessment) or the LDAA (Locally-Developed Alternative Assessment). Stanford 9 data from 2001 through 2003 are included, disaggregated data is not available from the test vendor.

2. Monitoring and Use of Assessment Data

The teachers, administrators, and support personnel utilize a myriad of available assessment tools to plan and formulate the academic direction.

The Vanguard population uses the District supported PASS test results based on the Houston Independent School District’s (HISD) Project CLEAR curriculum, the state TAKS test results, Stanford test results, and a number of teacher-developed assessment methods.

The Deaf utilizes State Developed Alternative Assessment (SDAA), Locally Developed Alternative Assessment (LDAA), and a criterion-based, teacher developed assessment. The MI staff develops database forms individualized for each student, and works with our evaluation specialists to develop an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) for each child to develop the specific needs of that student. Numerous checkpoints are built in to measure success, and it is always an option to re-evaluate and adjust the student’s IEP as needed. In any event, IEP’s are re-evaluated at least once every year. This IEP process also applies to our Deaf student population. Additionally, the MI staff utilizes the (Functional Skills Screening Inventory) FSSI and Skills Activities Matrixing System (SAMS) assessment tools for their students.

Finally, T.H. Rogers is in constant motion to update, improve and evolve to meet our students’ needs through committees consisting of campus-related staff, parents, and students. Those committees are the Admission/Review/Dismissal Committee, Language Proficient Assessment Committee, Parent Advisory Committee, Grade Placement Committee, Site Decision Making Committee, Faculty Advisory Committee, Campus Referral/Intervention Assistance Committee, Security/Safety Committee, Student Advisory Committee, Student Attendance Committee, Discipline Committee, Entrance/Exit for Advanced Academics Committee, and the 504 committee.

3. Communicating Student Performance

Our greatest pride here at TH Rogers is communicating our exemplary student performance to the parents, students, and community at large. Through many forms of communication and media, the staff,

students, parents, and district ensure that student achievement and assessment data is readily accessible and efficiently disseminated to all.

We highlight such data in the Ram News, a monthly newsletter, distribute letters from the principal, publish the School Improvement Plan, issue progress reports every 3-4 weeks and report cards on a nine week schedule. Because Rogers Elementary is an Exemplary school, results of our assessment data are also published at least annually in the *Houston Chronicle*. During daily television broadcasts student academic and extra-curricular achievements are communicated on closed-circuit Channel 16 KRAM News. On the world-wide web, news of student performance is only a click away at <http://ms.houstonisd.org/THRogers>. The “Awards,” “Announcements,” and “Curriculum” links on the site provide up-to-the-minute details of student success and progress as well as homework reminders.

The T. H. Rogers community and its’ visitors need only to walk our halls and sidewalks to get a feel for what our students are doing. Plaques, student’s works on bulletin boards, exhibit tables, and trophy cases serve as visual reminders of student success. Messages on our lawn-side marquee let passers-by know that there is learning going on inside our walls. Communicating student performance keeps our students and staff motivated to keep building on our success.

4. Sharing Success With Other Schools

T.H. Rogers Elementary continues its long-standing tradition as a mentor school, both regionally and worldwide. We welcome numerous educators and groups who observe our various programs, our staff is often requested to lead both district and regional in-services, and our administrative and professional support staff is often utilized to assist in the evaluation of non-Rogers’ students and academic programs. Because Rogers has a large number of students that are gifted and talented, deaf, and multiply impaired, which is typically a low-incidence population at most other schools, we have developed specialized programs and techniques that maximize learning.

When we find materials or procedures that work with our students, we share this information with teachers of individual classes located in the neighborhood schools. We hold workshops for teachers of the gifted and talented as well as for teachers of the multiply impaired and deaf to explain not only the background and theories behind some of our specialized programs, but also how to implement these ideas in their own classrooms. A number of university programs, including University of Houston, Rice University, Houston Baptist University, St. Thomas University, Texas A & M, and Lamar University often come to observe our programs. Although we are not a “neighborhood” school *per se*, we often invite area schools to participate in numerous events of interest to fellow students and teachers.

Because of the diverse population we serve and our successful teaching methods, we are constantly sharing our methods of success with the broader education community. Several times a year, our school is visited by fellow educators from abroad who have heard of our gifted and talented academic and special education programs via our school website or word-of-mouth. Visitors from as far away as Korea, China, England, and Brazil have come to learn about our programs, which in their countries are either non-existent or in the beginning stages of development, especially among their disabled populations. One of our most heart-warming successes has been with students from other schools who come into Rogers to volunteer with our multiply impaired students. They not only learn the techniques and reasoning behind how the students are educated, but become passionate ambassadors for students with special needs, and are able to explain the program to staff and peers in their own schools.

PART V -- CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

1. The Comprehensive Curriculum of T. H. Rogers School

The MI curriculum focuses on the development of functional skills within the classroom, school, and community at large. Routines are established which emphasize maximum student participation in a variety of areas, and priority is given to skills which are used with greatest frequency and which allow students the best access to people and materials in their environments. Communication is a major

emphasis to allow non-verbal students a method to communicate their needs, wants, and desires to others in their world.

The Deaf program has at its core language development as the key to success in each subject area. Students are immersed in language-rich experiences from the age of three. The structured programs we use include Language for Learning, Direct Instruction for Reading, and Saxon Math, supplemented by creative interdisciplinary units developed by the teachers. All academic areas are enriched by classes in Art, Science, Performing Arts, Social Studies, and Science, and monthly field trips highlight learning both as a pre-teaching and culminating experience. Deaf students at Rogers also have the opportunity to compete on the school level in Spelling Bee and Science Fair. The Deaf integrate with Vanguard and MI through activities such as Kite Day (highlighting aerospace and wind machines), a traditional Field Day, Rogersburg (simulating a colonial town), Gardening and Native Plant areas, and other school-wide programs. All Vanguard students are instructed in Sign Language to facilitate integration, and of course we use Deaf Awareness Month in September to share and inform the staff, parents, and students about Deafness.

The Vanguard curriculum is designed to meet the needs of our gifted and talented students in grades K-5 by providing an educational environment where they may successfully and cooperatively work with their cognitive peers. Vertically aligned and differentiated in depth, complexity and pacing, the program develops intellectual ability, critical thinking skills, and leadership ability. Our multi-faceted Reading/Language Arts curriculum includes not only basic skills, but also provides ample opportunities to practice and expand skills in writing, reading and spelling. Our students participate in a program called WITS (Writers in the Public Schools) where local authors teach writing techniques, then participate in the statewide Rising Star contest for poetry, short stories and art. In the Digital Book Fair original stories are written, illustrated and artistically bound for competition. Rogers' students have received the highest recognition and honors from these contests, thus confirming our need for a challenging curriculum for gifted and talented students. In addition, higher level reading is stimulated through the Accelerated Reader Renaissance Program in which students are provided ample choices on challenging reading levels where they can self-monitor their progress. In mathematics, students are exposed to daily hands-on activities, and teachers employ both algebraic and geometric initiatives to provide a strong foundation in mathematical thinking, and we participate in Math Olympiads and Number Sense contests. Chess is also taught as enrichment instruction to promote predictive, logical thinking skills. In addition, our integration of the core subjects of Reading, Social Studies and Science into our Math curriculum has proven beneficial. Since our elementary school is so widely diverse, the Social Studies curriculum explores holidays around the world with emphasis on customs and traditions, in addition to the general curriculum. We also confirm mastery of basic skills by promoting participation in the annual Geography Bee, and have been fortunate to send many entrants past the district competition level. Parents are eagerly invited as community resource volunteers to impart their personal knowledge of the heritage and culture of various countries through direct classroom presentations. Finally, the curriculum's emphasis on critical thinking is notable in the Science curriculum, which is also hands-on and lab-based. With a Science specialist as a full-time employee and a separate elementary Science Lab, our students are well versed in the scientific method. Our teachers have also been trained in HU-LINC, a grant-funded program for training and supplying educators with scientific equipment and activities. The result of this broad-based Science curriculum is reflected in our students' success, on all levels, in Science Fair and Odyssey of the Mind competitions.

2. Reading Curriculum

T. H. Rogers' Vanguard reading curriculum is dictated by the objectives put forth in the Texas state-mandated curriculum, the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS). In order to focus upon the specific needs of our students, we follow HISD's "A Balanced Approach to Reading" which contains the broad-based components of alphabetic, phonemic, orthographic, and print awareness in grades K-3. In the intermediate grades our focus is on developing improved word recognition, increasing fluency and automaticity at appropriate reading difficulty levels, predicting and summarizing, and complex analysis of diverse genres. To ensure student success, our program provides abundant opportunities

for our learners to build upon successful experiences in reading through a variety of techniques and exposures to literature. We utilize whole-group instruction, flexible small-group instructional configurations, instructional work-stations, paired groupings, independent projects, and Accelerated Reading Intervention programs to best address our students' needs and optimize student achievement. Our gifted and talented program not only promotes achievement of basic skills, but also stimulates higher-order thinking and critical thinking skills as portrayed in Bloom's Taxonomy, Sandra Kaplan's Scholars and Knowledge Program, and Kagan's Multiple Intelligences. These approaches provide our students with a differentiated curriculum by modifying the depth, complexity, and pacing of the general school program in all academic areas, thus meeting the needs of all children. It is through this multi-faceted combination of research-based techniques that our students have consistently shown growth and success by scoring in the top 10% on state assessments for the past 16 years.

The Deaf reading curriculum is on the cutting edge. Classically Deaf children fall behind in reading scores due to the fact that the majority of people learn to read by "sounding out" words. We are presently involved in a pilot program using Visual Phonics to teach Deaf children to read. Visual Phonics allows the deaf child to see the sounds and gives them a boost in breaking the code of reading. Visual Phonics is used for the scripted program by SRA called Corrective Reading. We are in the second year of a three-year trial under the guidance of our reading deaf education consultant, Beverly Trezek, from the University of Wisconsin. The reading instruction is supplemented with various techniques known to succeed with deaf children, such as creating small plays about stories, teacher made hands-on activities related to real and imaginary stories, and reward reading programs, such as Book It! In this program, students are rewarded after reading a set number of books prescribed by the teacher.

3. Science Curriculum

The Science curriculum of T. H. Rogers Elementary School is driven by the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) and Houston Independent School District's CLEAR (Clarifying Learning to Enhance Achievement Results) Curriculum. Various research-based learning theories are the premise of both of these directives. CLEAR aligns the districts and state objectives while emphasizing scientific process, skill connections. The Science curriculum faculty creatively adheres to the TEKS and CLEAR curriculum by employing Constructivist learning theory and Inquiry Based learning strategies. This approach relies on student involvement and collaboration to yield conceptual understanding and discovery. Students work as disciplinarians employing the scientific method and science process skills in "hands-on" activities enjoyed in the self-contained classroom, science lab, school gardens and science related field trips. Teachers work as facilitators who encourage and nurture inquiry habits and reasoning.

Instructors use the Collaborative Learning Theory, which allows students to work in groups to develop and construct their learning by discussing observations, and obtaining and analyzing data to conceptualize ideas. The Problem Based learning approach promotes effective use of critical thinking skills through discovery. These discovery opportunities focus on critical thinking skills and the more challenging aspects of the Blooms Taxonomy, and student assignments and activities are designed and patterned by the Dimensions of Depth and Complexity as created by Sandra Kaplan. These learning theories and strategies are implemented to encourage students who can apply their learning as they choose and design their own mandatory science fair projects. T. H. Rogers instructors implement skills and strategies acquired through professional training at the district's Science Lead Teacher workshops, Gifted and Talented workshops, Rice University's HULINC program, and other Professional Development opportunities. The thorough preparation of the students and faculty provides for successful compliance with the school's mission, "... to provide all students with the educational opportunity to develop to their fullest potential." This faculty strives to develop students who construct knowledge that is accessible, transferable and applicable.

4. Instructional Methods

The teacher to promote optimum student learning uses a wide variety of instructional methods at T. H. Rogers, each chosen. In the Multiply Impaired Unit, skills within daily functional routines are analyzed and broken down to provide maximum participation by each student, especially those who are at a low level of functioning. Community based instruction allows the student to practice the skills he or she

has learned in settings other than the classroom. In order to promote communication with these students, a calendar system is often used which cues the student to routines in their day by use of representational objects or pictures. Students may also be provided with voice-output devices with single or multiple messages which they access by using different parts of their bodies in order to communicate.

The Deaf program has used direct Instruction (DI) the past few years with evident improvement in language, reading and writing skills. By delivering a quick paced lesson, acknowledging positive student behavior, following DI lesson procedures and using data to guide instructional decisions, student success is assured.

The Vanguard teachers use methods to inform and challenge their students as well as to encourage them to accept responsibility for their learning. Methods such as Think-Pair-Share, inquiry, role playing, co-operative learning, and concept maps are among those used.

Every teacher in our school, before choosing a particular method, considers the age and developmental level of each student, what the child already knows, what she or he needs to know next to reach each objective, and the student's learning style. Every teacher in our school is committed to the children in her or his care and believes he or she can find a way to teach each child.

5. Professional Development

T. H. Rogers School is committed to supporting continual professional development of the staff as a cornerstone of educational improvement. Utilizing data from research on effective methodology for adult learners, the school has designed a multi-faceted approach. The foundation is a six-day staff development program that centers on five strands of best teacher practices, interpersonal skills, technology, current trends, and new employee training. To meet the unique needs of the staff due to diversified teaching fields and experience, the staff development program offers a choice of training whenever possible. A professional library of training tapes and professional journals provides for individualized learning. Topic centered study groups provide in-depth learning. Each teacher is allocated one substitute day to use to attend outside workshops, and the PTO has committed to paying up to \$50 of the tuition for any workshop. The faculty was surveyed for specific topics of interest in January. Members of the Instructional Council and the team leaders met with the specific teams to identify topics to support the School Improvement Plan goals for the coming year. The school will continue the specific training identified under the Comprehensive Analysis Program for Special Education developed several years ago. The goals of professional development for 2003-2004 are conflict resolution and a school wide discipline-management program, CLEAR/TEKS, staff technology and paraprofessional training. Our campus has engaged in extensive curriculum support training in the area of CLEAR/TEKS and will continue to do so. Training is inclusive of the Internet, digitizing our campus networking system, graphic calculators and any necessary instruction indicated by staff survey and requests. Time will be spent applying the knowledge in the lab or classroom setting. RDSPD teachers will continue training in the TEKS, CLEAR, and the Direct Instruction program.

NATIONAL NORM REFERENCE TEST DATA

Grade: 1

Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year Ninth/See Table

Publisher Harcourt Brace & Company

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered See Table

Number of students who took the test See Table

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? The deaf students and the multiply impaired students were excluded from the Stanford Nine due to their disabilities. The deaf students are assessed with an approved State Developed Alternative Test (SDAA) and The multiply impaired students are assessed using Locally Developed Alternative Test (LDAA), Skills Activities Matrixing System (SAMS), and the Functional Skills Screening Inventory (FSSI).

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores ____ Percentiles ____

READING – Grade 1	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	March	February	February
Publication Year	2001	2001	1996
SCHOOL SCORES			
First Grade Vanguard	89	92	86
Number of students tested	18	19	22
Percent of students tested	46%	49%	71%
Number of students excluded	21	20	9
Percent of students excluded	54%	51%	29%
SUBGROUP SCORES*			
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			

*Stanford Nine Scores are not disaggregated for socioeconomic or ethnic/racial groups.

N/A = Not Available.

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION					

Grade: 1

Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year Ninth/See Table

Publisher Harcourt Brace & Company

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered See Table

Number of students who took the test See Table

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? The deaf students and the multiply impaired students were excluded from the Stanford Nine due to their disabilities. The deaf students are assessed with an approved State Developed Alternative Test (SDAA) and The multiply impaired students are assessed using Locally Developed Alternative Test (LDAA), Skills Activities Matrixing System (SAMS), and the Functional Skills Screening Inventory (FSSI).

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores ____ Percentiles ____

MATH – Grade 1	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	March	February	February
Publication Year	2001	2001	1996
SCHOOL SCORES			
First Grade Vanguard	87	92	86
Number of students tested	18	19	22
Percent of students tested	46%	49%	71%
Number of students excluded	21	20	9
Percent of students excluded	54%	51%	29%
SUBGROUP SCORES*			
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			

*Stanford Nine Scores are not disaggregated for socioeconomic or ethnic/racial groups.

N/A = Not Available.

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION					

Grade: 2

Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year Ninth/See Table

Publisher Harcourt Brace & Company

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered See Table

Number of students who took the test See Table

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? The deaf students and the multiply impaired students were excluded from the Stanford Nine due to their disabilities. The deaf students are assessed with an approved State Developed Alternative Test (SDAA) and The multiply impaired students are assessed using Locally Developed Alternative Test (LDAA), Skills Activities Matrixing System (SAMS), and the Functional Skills Screening Inventory (FSSI).

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores ____ Percentiles ____

READING – Grade 2	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	March	February	February
Publication Year	2001	2001	1996
SCHOOL SCORES			
Second Grade Vanguard	74	76	79
Number of students tested	19	19	22
Percent of students tested	59%	61%	56%
Number of students excluded	13	12	17
Percent of students excluded	41%	39%	44%
SUBGROUP SCORES*			
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			

*Stanford Nine Scores are not disaggregated for socioeconomic or ethnic/racial groups.

N/A = Not Available.

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION					

Grade: 2

Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year Ninth/See Table

Publisher Harcourt Brace & Company

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered See Table

Number of students who took the test See Table

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? The deaf students and the multiply impaired students were excluded from the Stanford Nine due to their disabilities. The deaf students are assessed with an approved State Developed Alternative Test (SDAA) and The multiply impaired students are assessed using Locally Developed Alternative Test (LDAA), Skills Activities Matrixing System (SAMS), and the Functional Skills Screening Inventory (FSSI).

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores ____ Percentiles ____

MATH – Grade 2	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	March	February	February
Publication Year	2001	2001	1996
SCHOOL SCORES			
Second Grade Vanguard	81	77	81
Number of students tested	19	19	22
Percent of students tested	59%	61%	56%
Number of students excluded	13	12	17
Percent of students excluded	41%	39%	44%
SUBGROUP SCORES*			
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			

*Stanford Nine Scores are not disaggregated for socioeconomic or ethnic/racial groups.

N/A = Not Available.

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION					

Grade 3

Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year Ninth/See Table

Publisher Harcourt Brace & Company

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered See Table

Number of students who took the test See Table

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? The deaf students and the multiply impaired students were excluded from the Stanford Nine due to their disabilities. The deaf students are assessed with an approved State Developed Alternative Test (SDAA) and The multiply impaired students are assessed using Locally Developed Alternative Test (LDAA), Skills Activities Matrixing System (SAMS), and the Functional Skills Screening Inventory (FSSI).

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores ____ Percentiles ____

READING – Grade 3	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	March	February	February
Publication Year	2001	2001	1996
SCHOOL SCORES			
Third Grade Vanguard	86	77	83
Number of students tested	20	18	22
Percent of students tested	51%	46%	59%
Number of students excluded	19	21	15
Percent of students excluded	49%	54%	41%
SUBGROUP SCORES*			
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			

*Stanford Nine Scores are not disaggregated for socioeconomic or ethnic/racial groups.

N/A = Not Available.

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION					

Grade: 3

Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year Ninth/See Table

Publisher Harcourt Brace & Company

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered See Table

Number of students who took the test See Table

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? The deaf students and the multiply impaired students were excluded from the Stanford Nine due to their disabilities. The deaf students are assessed with an approved State Developed Alternative Test (SDAA) and The multiply impaired students are assessed using Locally Developed Alternative Test (LDAA), Skills Activities Matrixing System (SAMS), and the Functional Skills Screening Inventory (FSSI).

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores ____ Percentiles ____

MATH – Grade 3	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	March	February	February
Publication Year	2001	2001	1996
SCHOOL SCORES			
Third Grade Vanguard	78	74	85
Number of students tested	20	18	59
Percent of students tested	51%	46%	59%
Number of students excluded	19	21	15
Percent of students excluded	49%	54%	41%
SUBGROUP SCORES*			
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			

*Stanford Nine Scores are not disaggregated for socioeconomic or ethnic/racial groups.

N/A = Not Available.

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION					

Grade: 4

Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year Ninth/See Table

Publisher Harcourt Brace & Company

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered See Table

Number of students who took the test See Table

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? The deaf students and the multiply impaired students were excluded from the Stanford Nine due to their disabilities. The deaf students are assessed with an approved State Developed Alternative Test (SDAA) and The multiply impaired students are assessed using Locally Developed Alternative Test (LDAA), Skills Activities Matrixing System (SAMS), and the Functional Skills Screening Inventory (FSSI).

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores ____ Percentiles ____

READING – Grade 4	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	March	February	February
Publication Year	2001	2001	1996
SCHOOL SCORES			
Fourth Grade Vanguard	81	85	89
Number of students tested	38	39	42
Percent of students tested	64%	68%	61%
Number of students excluded	21	18	27
Percent of students excluded	36%	32%	39%
SUBGROUP SCORES*			
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			

*Stanford Nine Scores are not disaggregated for socioeconomic or ethnic/racial groups.

N/A = Not Available.

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION					

Grade: 4

Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year Ninth/See Table

Publisher Harcourt Brace & Company

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered See Table

Number of students who took the test See Table

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? The deaf students and the multiply impaired students were excluded from the Stanford Nine due to their disabilities. The deaf students are assessed with an approved State Developed Alternative Test (SDAA) and The multiply impaired students are assessed using Locally Developed Alternative Test (LDAA), Skills Activities Matrixing System (SAMS), and the Functional Skills Screening Inventory (FSSI).

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores ____ Percentiles ____

MATH – Grade 4	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	March	February	February
Publication Year	2001	2001	1996
SCHOOL SCORES			
Fourth Grade Vanguard	87	88	90
Number of students tested	38	39	42
Percent of students tested	64%	68%	61%
Number of students excluded	21	18	27
Percent of students excluded	36%	32%	39%
SUBGROUP SCORES*			
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			

*Stanford Nine Scores are not disaggregated for socioeconomic or ethnic/racial groups.

N/A = Not Available.

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION					

Grade: 5

Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year Ninth/See Table

Publisher Harcourt Brace & Company

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered See Table

Number of students who took the test See Table

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? The deaf students and the multiply impaired students were excluded from the Stanford Nine due to their disabilities. The deaf students are assessed with an approved State Developed Alternative Test (SDAA) and The multiply impaired students are assessed using Locally Developed Alternative Test (LDAA), Skills Activities Matrixing System (SAMS), and the Functional Skills Screening Inventory (FSSI).

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores ____ Percentiles ____

READING – Grade 5	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	March	February	February
Publication Year	2001	2001	1996
SCHOOL SCORES			
Fifth Grade Vanguard	83	84	81
Number of students tested	44	40	46
Percent of students tested	56%	51%	66%
Number of students excluded	35	39	24
Percent of students excluded	44%	49%	34%
SUBGROUP SCORES*			
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			

*Stanford Nine Scores are not disaggregated for socioeconomic or ethnic/racial groups.

N/A = Not Available.

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION					

Grade: 5

Test Stanford Achievement Test

Edition/publication year Ninth/See Table

Publisher Harcourt Brace & Company

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered See Table

Number of students who took the test See Table

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? The deaf students and the multiply impaired students were excluded from the Stanford Nine due to their disabilities. The deaf students are assessed with an approved State Developed Alternative Test (SDAA) and The multiply impaired students are assessed using Locally Developed Alternative Test (LDAA), Skills Activities Matrixing System (SAMS), and the Functional Skills Screening Inventory (FSSI).

Scores are reported here as (check one): NCEs X Scaled scores ____ Percentiles ____

MATH – Grade 5	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001
Testing Month	March	February	February
Publication Year	2001	2001	1996
SCHOOL SCORES			
Fifth Grade Vanguard	88	87	91
Number of students tested	44	40	66
Percent of students tested	56%	51%	66%
Number of students excluded	35	39	24
Percent of students excluded	44%	49%	34%
SUBGROUP SCORES*			
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			

*Stanford Nine Scores are not disaggregated for socioeconomic or ethnic/racial groups.

N/A = Not Available.

	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
NATIONAL MEAN SCORE					
NATIONAL STANDARD DEVIATION					

STATE CRITERION REFERENCED TESTS

Grade 3 - 5

Tests: 1998-2002 - Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS)
2003 Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)

Edition/publication year 1998-2003

Publisher Texas Education Agency (TEA)

Number of students in the grade in which the test was administered See Table on Individual Grade

Number of students who took the test See Table on Individual Grade

What groups were excluded from testing? Why, and how were they assessed? The deaf and the multiply impaired students were excluded from the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) or Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) due to their disabilities. The deaf students are assessed with an approved State Developed Alternative Assessment (SDAA) and the multiply impaired students are assessed using Locally Developed Alternative Assessment (LDAA), Skills Activities Matrixing System (SAMS), and the Functional Skills Screening Inventory (FSSI).

Number excluded See Individual Grade Level Tables

Percent excluded See Individual Grade Level Tables

Explain the standards for basic, proficient, and advanced (or the relevant state categories), and make clear what the test results mean in a way that someone unfamiliar with the test can interpret the results.

RELEVANT STATE CATEGORIES

MET STANDARD = Meeting state minimum passage of 70% of objectives answered correctly.

COMMENDED PERFORMANCE = Meeting 100% of all objectives tested. This category is not available by subgroups

BELOW STANDARD = Failure to meet 70% of all objectives tested.

Data Display Table for Reading and Mathematics (Language Arts or English).

Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (1999 – 2002)
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (2003)

READING – Grade 3	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month	March	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance	82%	90%	91%	95%	94%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	22	21	22	22	18
Percent of students tested	58%	54%	59%	49%	51%
Number of students excluded	16	18	15	23	16
Percent of students excluded	42%	46%	41%	51%	46%
Percent Absent	-	-	-	-	3%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. AFRICAN AMERICAN					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	4	3	2	4	3
2. HISPANIC					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	3	3	3	2	2
3. WHITE					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	75%	50%	45%	67%	86%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	8	8	11	12	7
4. ASIAN					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	100%	43%	33%	N/A	83%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	7	7	6	3	6
STATE SCORES					
TOTAL					
% Met Standard	90%	88%	87%	88%	88%
% Commended Performance**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
% Below Standard***					
State Mean Score****					

*Met Standard = Meeting state minimum passage of 70% of objectives answered correctly.

**Commended Performance = Meeting 100% of all objectives. Subgroups not available on state scores and campus scores when less than five students are tested.

***Below Standard = Vendor does not report these numbers.

****State Mean Score – State Mean Scores not reported by test vendor.

N/A = Not Available

Data Display Table for Reading and Mathematics (Language Arts or English).

Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (1999 – 2002)

Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (2003)

MATH – Grade 3	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month	March	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance	91%	52%	41%	55%	78%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	22	21	22	22	18
Percent of students tested	58%	54%	59%	49%	51%
Number of students excluded	16	18	15	23	16
Percent of students excluded	42%	46%	41%	51%	46%
Percent Absent	-	-	-	-	3%
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. AFRICAN AMERICAN					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	4	3	2	4	3
2. HISPANIC					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	3	3	3	3	2
3. WHITE					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	100%	50%	45%	67%	%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	8	8	11	12	7
4. ASIAN					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	100%	57%	33%	N/A	%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	7	7	6	3	6
STATE SCORES					
TOTAL					
% Met Standard	91%	87%	83%	81%	83%
% Commended Performance**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
% Below Standard***					
State Mean Score****					

*Met Standard = Meeting state minimum passage of 70% of objectives answered correctly.

**Commended Performance = Meeting 100% of all objectives. Subgroups not available on state scores and campus scores when less than five students are tested.

***Below Standard = Vendor does not report these numbers.

****State Mean Score – State Mean Scores not reported by test vendor.

N/A = Not Available

Data Display Table for Reading and Mathematics (Language Arts or English).

Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (1999 – 2002)

Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (2003)

READING – Grade 4	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month	March	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance	53%	86%	95%	78%	95%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	40	43	42	41	41
Percent of students tested	70%	75%	61%	69%	65%
Number of students excluded	17	14	27	17	22
Percent of students excluded	30%	25%	39%	29%	35%
Percent Absent	-	-	-	2%	-
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. AFRICAN AMERICAN					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	N/A	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	4	5	7	4	3
2. HISPANIC					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	N/A	60%	N/A	100%	N/A
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	4	5	4	5	3
3. WHITE					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	42%	85%	95%	76%	100%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	12	16	20	17	22
4. ASIAN					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	50%	100%	91%	87%	91%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	20	17	11	15	11
STATE SCORES					
TOTAL					
% Met Standard	86%	93%	91%	90%	89%
% Commended Performance**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
% Below Standard***					
State Mean Score****					

*Met Standard = Meeting state minimum passage of 70% of objectives answered correctly.

**Commended Performance = Meeting 100% of all objectives. Subgroups not available on state scores and campus scores when less than five students are tested.

***Below Standard = Vendor does not report these numbers.

****State Mean Score – State Mean Scores not reported by test vendor.

N/A = Not Available

Data Display Table for Reading and Mathematics (Language Arts or English).

Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (1999 – 2002)

Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (2003)

MATH – Grade 4	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month	March	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance	73%	56%	45%	81%	95%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	40	43	42	42	41
Percent of students tested	70%	75%	61%	71%	65%
Number of students excluded	17	14	27	17	22
Percent of students excluded	30%	25%	39%	29%	35%
Percent Absent					
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. AFRICAN AMERICAN					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	N/A	40%	64%	N/A	N/A
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	4	5	7	4	3
2. HISPANIC					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	N/A	60%	N/A	100%	N/A
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	4	5	4	5	3
3. WHITE					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	83%	56%	45%	89%	100%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	12	16	20	18	22
4. ASIAN					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	65%	59%	64%	80%	91%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	20	17	11	15	11
STATE SCORES					
TOTAL					
% Met Standard	88%	94%	91%	87%	88%
% Commended Performance**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
% Below Standard***					
State Mean Score****					

*Met Standard = Meeting state minimum passage of 70% of objectives answered correctly.

**Commended Performance = Meeting 100% of all objectives. Subgroups not available on state scores and campus scores when less than five students are tested.

***Below Standard = Vendor does not report these numbers.

****State Mean Score – State Mean Scores not reported by test vendor.

N/A = Not Available

Data Display Table for Reading and Mathematics (Language Arts or English).

Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (1999 – 2002)
Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (2003)

READING – Grade 5	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month	March	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance	69%	96%	95%	93%	87%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	49	45	42	40	45
Percent of students tested	62%	57%	60%	70%	73%
Number of students excluded	30	34	28	17	17
Percent of students excluded	48%	43%	40%	28%	27%
Percent Absent	-	-	-	2%	-
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. AFRICAN AMERICAN					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	80%	83	N/A	N/A	90%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	5	6	4	2	10
2. HISPANIC					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	40%	100	100%	80%	60%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	5	5	6	5	5
3. WHITE					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	65%	95	95%	95%	86%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	20	21	19	20	21
4. ASIAN					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	79%	100	100%	91%	100%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	19	13	17	11	9
5. NATIVE AMERICAN					
% Met Standard				100%	
% Commended Performance**				NA	
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested				2	
STATE SCORES					
TOTAL					
% Met Standard	80%	93%	90%	88%	86%
% Commended Performance**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
% Below Standard***					
State Mean Score****					

*Met Standard = Meeting state minimum passage of 70% of objectives answered correctly.

**Commended Performance = Meeting 100% of all objectives. Subgroups not available on state scores and campus scores when less than five students are tested.

***Below Standard = Vendor does not report these numbers.

****State Mean Score – State Mean Scores not reported by test vendor.

N/A = Not Available

(Grade 5 Math continued on next two pages.)

Data Display Table for Reading and Mathematics (Language Arts or English).

Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (1999 – 2002)

Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (2003)

MATH – Grade 5	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000	1998-1999
Testing Month	March	April	April	April	April
SCHOOL SCORES					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance	80%	62%	72%	83%	71%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	49	45	46	42	45
Percent of students tested	62%	57%	66%	70%	73%
Number of students excluded	30	34	24	17	17
Percent of students excluded	38%	43%	34%	28%	27%
Percent Absent	-	-	-	2%	-
SUBGROUP SCORES					
1. AFRICAN AMERICAN					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	80%	33%	N/A	N/A	40%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	5	6	4	3	10
2. HISPANIC					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	80%	40%	50%	80%	40%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	5	5	6	5	5
3. WHITE					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	70%	67%	79%	81%	86%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	20	21	19	21	21
4. ASIAN					
% Met Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% Commended Performance**	89%	77%	71%	100%	89%
% Below Standard***					
Number of students tested	19	13	17	11	9
5. NATIVE AMERICAN					
% Met Standard				100%	
% Commended Performance**				N/A	
% Below Standard****					
Number of students tested				2	
STATE SCORES					
TOTAL					
% Met Standard	86%	96%	95%	92%	90%
% Commended Performance**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
% Below Standard***					
State Mean Score****					

*Met Standard = Meeting state minimum passage of 70% of objectives answered correctly.

**Commended Performance = Meeting 100% of all objectives. Subgroups not available on state scores and campus scores when less than five students are tested.

***Below Standard = Vendor does not report these numbers.

****State Mean Score – State Mean Scores not reported by test vendor.

N/A = Not Available